```
THIMESCH LAW OFFICES
 1
     Timothy S. Thimesch, Esq. [148213]
 2
     Gene A. Farber, Esq. 44215
     185 Hillcrest Drive
 3
     Walnut Creek, CA 94597-3452
     Telephone: (925) 588-0401
 4
     Facsimile: (888) 210-8868
 5
     tim@thimeschlaw.com
     genefarber@gmail.com
 6
     Attorneys for Plaintiff
 7
     CRAIG YATES
 8
                          UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
                        NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
      CRAIG YATES,
                                                   Case No. C 07 4087 JSW
11
                         Plaintiff,
12
                                                   STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
                                                   CONTINUE CASE MANAGEMENT
      VS.
13
                                                   CONFERENCE; [PROPOSED]
14
      UNION SQUARE; CITY AND COUNTY
                                                   ORDER THEREON
      OF SAN FRANCISCO; CITY OF SAN
15
                                                   Trial Date:
                                                                     None Set
      FRANCISCO UPTOWN PARKING
                                                   Complaint Filed:
      CORPORATION, and DOES 1 through 50,
                                                                     August 9, 2007
16
      Inclusive.
17
                         Defendants.
18
           TO THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES:
19
           The parties, Plaintiff, Craig Yates, and Defendants, City and County Of San
20
     Francisco and City Of San Francisco Uptown Parking Corporation ("Defendants"),
21
     collectively, the "Parties", by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate to a
22
     continuance of the Case Management Conference currently scheduled for April 4, 2008,
23
     for 30 days.
2.4
                  A.
                          Recitals. On August 9, 2007, Plaintiff filed his complaint in this
25
26
     lawsuit (the "Complaint") against Defendants for Injunctive & Declaratory Relief and
27
     Damages.
28
                  В.
                        On November 19, 2007, Plaintiff filed a Request for Dismissal of
```

Defendants Emporio Rulli Il Caffe Union Sq. and Emporio Rulli Il Caffe Union Sq., Inc
which was granted on November 19, 2007.

- C. On December 6, 2007, the Parties met and conferred at the subject property.
- D. On December 12, 2007, Defendants re-filed their Motion for the Court to Decline Supplemental Jurisdiction Over and to Dismiss Plaintiff's State Law Claims [28 U.S.C. Section 1367 (c) and to Strike Plaintiff's Unsupported and Improper Damage Prayers from the Complaint [FRCP 12 (f)] ("Motion") which was originally filed on September 28, 2007, before Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte, and transferred to this Court for hearing on the Motion set for February 8, 2008.
- E. On or about January 28, 2008 all counsel met pursuant to General Order 56.
- F. On February 4, 2008 the parties met at the Union Square site and plaintiff examined multiple copies of blueprints of Union Square and underground garage
- G. On February 7, 2008 the Court filed its order on the Motion. The Court found that the matter was appropriate for disposition without oral argument and granted the moving defendants' Motion to decline supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims and denied in part and granted in part the moving defendants' motion to strike.
- H. On or about March 10, 2008 the plaintiff filed his notice of appeal of this Court's order granting the defendants' Motion to dismiss plaintiff's state law claims and striking related state law claims. Defendants question whether this appeal is properly filed.
- I. On or about March 11, 2008 the plaintiff filed a complaint on his state law claims in San Francisco Superior court as case # CGC –08-473176. Defendants question whether this new lawsuit was properly filed in light of plaintiff's above-referenced appeal.
  - J. Plaintiff is still inspecting the site and the parties have not

1	completed the process set forth in General Order Rule 56.		
2	K. Martin Orlick, Esq., counsel for defendants, will be out of the area		
3	and unavailable on May 15 through May 26, 2008, inclusive, and Defendants request that		
4	the Court schedule the Continued Case Management Conference on a date outside this		
5	date range.		
6	In light of the foregoing recitals, the Parties request the Court continue the Case		
7	Management Conference for thirty (30) days for a date other than May 15 through May 26, 2008.		
8			
9 10 11	DATED: March , 2008	THIMESCH LAW OFFICES TIMOTHY S. THIMESCH GENE A. FARBER	
12		By: /s/ Signature Authorized	
13		Attorneys for Plaintiff CRAIG YATES	
14	DATED: March , 2008	JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO LLI	
15	Brilds. Water , 2000	MARTIN H. ORLICK MATTHEW S. KENEFICK	
16			
17		By: /s/ Signature Authorized Attorneys for Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
19		UPTOWN PARKING CORPORATION	
20	DATED: March , 2008	OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY ELAINE O'NEIL	
21		JAMES MOXON EMERY	
22		By: /s/ Signature Authorized	
23		Attorneys for Defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
24			
25	ORDER.		
26	The parties having so stipulated, and good cause appearing therefore,		
27			
28			

IT IS SO ORDERED that the Case Management Conference currently scheduled for April 4, 2008, be continued for thirty (30) days to  $\underline{\text{May 30, 2}}$ 008 at 1:30 p.m. DATED: March 27, 2008